

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 45 and 61-65 for informalities therein. In particular, as the Examiner noted, there are typographical errors in Claims 45 and 63 and “planarizing film” should be “passivation film.” Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

The Examiner also notes that Claims 61-65 depend on Claim 54. As the Examiner notes, this is a typographical error, and these claims should depend on Claim 60. Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these objections have been overcome, and it is requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

- (a) Claims 1, 3, 32, 33 and 48-51 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tang et al. (U.S. 5,550,066) in view of Nishiguchi (U.S. 6,046,787).
- (b) Claims 34, 35, 52 and 53 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tang et al. in view of Nishiguchi and further in view of Takahara (U.S. 6,219,113).
- (c) Claims 36-39, 42-45, 54-57 and 60-63 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tang et al. in view of Hamada (U.S. 6,114,715) and further in view of Nishiguchi.
- (d) Claims 40, 41, 46, 47, 58, 59, 64 and 65 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tang et al. in view of Hamada, in view of Nishiguchi and further in view of Takahara.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed¹.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54 and 60.

More specifically, independent Claims 1, 36, and 42 are directed to a camera and recite in the body of the claim the features of a body of the camera, and an electroluminescence display device attached to the body of the camera. Independent Claims 48, 54, and 60 are directed to a camera and recite in the body of the claim, a body of the camera and a view finder including an electroluminescence display device attached to the body of the camera.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the feature of a camera or a camera having a view finder are in the preambles of the claims and are not limitations of the claims and are not necessary to give life, meaning or vitality to the claims. While Applicants disagree, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the claims to recite these features as limitations of the claims in the body of the claims.

As Applicants previously explained, one of the objects of the present invention and present application is to provide a camera having a display device which can present large images and a view finder for such a camera. See e.g. page 3, lines 11-15 of the specification of the present application. These claim features of the amended claims accomplish this objective.

As the Examiner has not considered these features, it is respectfully requested that this Office Action be withdrawn so that the Examiner can reexamine the claims to consider these features.

Further, each of the above rejections is based on the combination of Tang and Nishiguchi. However, even if these references were properly combinable (which Applicants do not admit), such a

¹ In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Applicant does not traverse the prior art rejection of Claims 36-41, 42-47, 54 and 59 and 60-65. This statement is not understood as Applicants clearly traversed the rejection of these claims and continue to traverse the rejection of these claims.

combination still fails to achieve or make obvious the claimed invention which is directed to a camera and includes the features of a camera body and an electroluminescence display device attached to the body or a view finder including an electroluminescence display device attached to the body.

For example, neither Tang nor Nishiguchi disclose or suggest a camera, a camera body, or an electroluminescence display device or view finder attached to the camera body. Instead, Nishiguchi is directed to a stereoscopic optical element which involves providing images for left and right eyes to produce the stereoscopic image. There would be no reason, motivation, or suggestion for one skilled in the art to utilize the structure of Nishiguchi for a display device of a camera, especially for a view finder of a camera, as in the claimed invention. Therefore, the amended claim features of independent Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54 and 60 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In addition, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Tang discloses a planarizing film 52 and cites col. 7, lines 17-19 in Tang in support of his contention. However, Tang merely teaches in column 7, lines 17-19 that “an insulating layer, preferably silicon dioxide, 52 is applied over the entire surface of the device.” Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that Tang does not teach a planarizing film.²

Further, the Examiner alleges that Takahara discloses an electroluminescence display device. Applicants have reviewed the reference and cannot find any mention of an electroluminescence display device. Therefore, if the Examiner intends to continue to make this assertion, it is respectfully requested that he provide a further explanation/clarification as to how this feature is allegedly disclosed in Takahara.

² The Examiner’s Office Notice is irrelevant with regard to this claim feature. The issue is not whether planarizing films comprising a resin are known, it is whether such a feature is disclosed or suggested in Tang. As explained herein, this feature is not disclosed or suggested in Tang.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54 and 60 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment or the extension of time, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568